



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/765,730	01/26/2004	Norbert Miller	SWR0124US	1107		
30008	7590	02/23/2011	EXAMINER			
GUDRUN E. HUCKETT DRAUDT SCHUBERTSTR. 15A WUPPERTAL, 42289 GERMANY				JOHNS, CHRISTOPHER C		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
3621						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
02/23/2011		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,730	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher C. Johns	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6 and 9-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6 and 9-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/17/2011</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 17 January 2011 has been entered.

Acknowledgements

2. This Office Action is given Paper No. 20110221 for reference purposes only.
3. This Office Action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination, filed 17 January 2011 (“January 2011 RCE”). The January 2011 RCE contained, inter alia, Claim Amendments (“January 2011 Amendments”) and Remarks/Arguments (“January 2011 Remarks”).
4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-13 are pending.
5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-13 have been examined.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: it recites “providing a sales machine configured for selling tickets the public transportation tickets, the sales machine being configured....” It is believed that this should read “for selling the public transportation tickets”

because the insertion of the extra “tickets” appears to be a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st Paragraph

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

9. Independent claim 1 recites “providing the sales machine with an intermediate storage configured to maintain documents accepted until the amount of the document corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket” (page 2, lines 9-11). The originally-filed disclosure does not contain clear support for maintaining multiple “documents” in an “intermediate storage” “until” a single one of those documents “corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket.” Rather, Applicants’ specification appears to disclose that the “individual means of payment” are “maintained in intermediate storage until the amount of the means payment that have been inserted corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket” ([0003]). That is, the sum of the amounts of all of the “means payment” that “have” been inserted is the determining factor, rather than the amount of a single “document.”

a. Applicants' claim language, as written, recites this situation: a user wants to purchase a \$20 ticket; the user inserts five \$5 bills and the "documents" (all five \$5 bills) will be "maintain[ed]" in the "intermediate storage" until a bill which either "corresponds to or exceeds" \$20 is inserted. Even though all five \$5 bills exceed the \$20 ticket purchase price, all of the bills will be maintained "until the amount of the document" - a single document - "corresponds to or exceeds" the \$20 that the ticket is worth.

10. The Examiner recognizes that this may be a mistake in claim drafting rather than an attempt to add new matter, and respectfully suggests amending the claims to recite that the documents are maintained until the sum of the maintained documents "corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket" as recited in [0003] of Applicants' original specification. A similar recitation exists on lines 22-24 of claim 1.

11. Independent claim 1 recites "comparing the at least two verification methods with verification specifications" (page 2, line 17). The originally-filed disclosure does not contain clear support for comparing the steps involved in a verification method with the verification method's specification. The specification, at [0017], notes that "verification specifications 5 are stored in the form of data sets," further noting that "[t]he results of the examinations that have been conducted are compared with these data sets." That is, the specification discloses comparing the results of an examination conducted using one of the "verification methods" with the corresponding specification for that "verification method."

12. The Examiner recognizes that this may be a mistake in claim drafting rather than an attempt to add new matter, and respectfully suggests amending the claims to recite that the verification specifications are compared with the "results" of the "at least two verification

methods” as disclosed in [0017] of Applicants’ original specification. A similar recitation exists in claim 10, on page 4, line 15; claim 10 is therefore rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd Paragraph

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

15. Independent claim 1 recites “wherein the document is accepted when the document has passed a visual examination of the visual verification and is maintained in the intermediate storage” (page 3, lines 4-7). The recitation of “visual examination of the visual verification” renders the claim indefinite because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not understand what a “visual examination” of a “visual verification” is. That is, the claims previously referred to a process of “visual verification” of the document, and the document passing the “visual verification.” Now, the claims recite an “examination” of the “visual verification.” A person having ordinary skill in the art would not understand whether “visual examination of the visual verification” means:

- b. a “visual” look at the results of the examination as performed by the machine;
- c. a “visual” look at the operator’s performance of the “visual verification;” or
- d. as the specification discloses in [0010], a “visual verification” wherein “the document can be presented to an operator.”

16. Thus, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not be able to reasonably determine what the steps in “a visual examination of the visual verification” would be. Because a person having ordinary skill in the art’s attempt to interpret the claim language would result in two or more dissimilar interpretations of the recited steps, the claim language is indefinite. As such, the USPTO is justified in requiring the Applicant to more precisely define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. For further guidance on this matter, see page 2, ¶1 of “Indefiniteness rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (signed 2 September 2008),” located at the USPTO’s website: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/patents/memoranda.htm>.

17. The Examiner suggests, assuming there is proper support under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph for it, amending claims 1 and 10 to recite simply that the document is accepted when it passes an operator’s visual verification. Independent claim 10 contains a similar recitation and is therefore rejected for similar reasons.

18. Independent claim 1 recites “recording the document...when the probability does not meet the predetermined criteria...wherein the document is accepted...and the document is refused...wherein the document is fed to a separate storage device for invalid documents or ejected” (page 3, lines 9-10). The recitation of “wherein the document is fed to a separate storage device for invalid documents or ejected” renders the claim indefinite because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not understand whether:

- e. the document is “fed to a separate storage device...or ejected” only if the “document is refused,” or
- f. the document is “fed to a separate storage device...or ejected” if the “document is accepted [or] refused.”

19. Because a person having ordinary skill in the art's attempt to interpret the claim language would result in two or more dissimilar interpretations of the recited steps, the claim language is indefinite. As such, the USPTO is justified in requiring the Applicant to more precisely define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. Claim 10 contains a similar recitation (page 5, lines 1-10) and is therefore similarly rejected.

20. The Examiner finds that because the claims are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, it is impossible to properly construe claim scope at this time. However, in accordance with MPEP §2173.06 and the USPTO's policy of trying to advance prosecution by providing art rejections even though claims may be indefinite, the claims are construed and the prior art is applied as much as practically possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art ("APA") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0006556 ("Graves"), further in view of U.S. Patent 5,537,486 ("Stratigos").

23. As per claim 1, APA discloses:

24. providing a sales machine ([0003] - "a sales machine") configured for selling public transportation tickets ([0003] - "a sales machine for selling tickets for public transportation");

25. sales machine configured to facilitate purchase of goods/services by a customer against payment of a document as cash in the form of banknotes or vouchers ([0003] - “banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained..”);
26. providing the sales machine with a verification unit ([0004] - “a verification unit”), wherein the verification unit is configured for authenticating the document ([0004] - “a verification unit, in which the document is authenticated”);
27. providing the sales machine with an intermediate storage ([0003] - “intermediate storage”) configured to maintain documents accepted until the amount of the document corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket ([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained in intermediate storage until the amount of the means payment that have been inserted corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket”);
28. feeding the document to the verification unit by means of an input unit ([0004] - “transport mechanism”), containing an opening into which the document can be inserted individually ([0004] - “the same...opening”) and consecutively (each document referred to in [0004] is inserted into the “opening”);
29. authenticating the document ([0004] - “document is authenticated and released for further processing”);
30. maintaining the document in the intermediate storage until the amount of the document corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket ([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained in intermediate storage until the amount of the means payment that have been inserted corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket”);

31. when the document is accepted, the document is maintained in the intermediate storage

([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and
maintained in intermediate storage”)

32. wherein the document is ejected ([0004] - “an invalid document is rejected via the same
or a separate opening”).

33. APA does not explicitly disclose:

34. wherein said authenticating the document is performed with a combination of at least two
different verification methods;

35. comparing the at least two verification methods with verification specifications;

36. determining a probability of authenticity of the document;

37. releasing the document for further processing, comprising accepting the document as
positively authenticated when the probability meets predetermined criteria;

38. Graves teaches:

39. wherein said authenticating the document is performed with a combination of at least two
([0077] - “Provided that an error has not been generated as a result of the first comparison...a
second comparison is performed”) different verification methods ([0077] - “This second
comparison is performed based on a second type of characteristic information”);

40. comparing the at least two verification methods with verification specifications ([0006] -
“a currency discriminator may detect suspect or counterfeit bills by sensing characteristic

information...then comparing the sensed information to the expected characteristics of a bill of the same denomination”);

41. determining a probability ([0078] - “sufficient correlation”) of authenticity of the document ([0078] - “CPU **72** retrieves the set or sets of stored second characteristic data for a genuine bill...and compares the retrieved information with the scanned second characteristic information. If sufficient correlation exists between the retrieved information and the scanned information, the CPU 72 verifies the genuineness of the scanned bill **57**”);

42. releasing the document for further processing, comprising accepting the document as positively authenticated when the probability meets predetermined criteria ([0078] - “If sufficient correlation exists between the retrieved information and the scanned information, the CPU 72 verifies the genuineness of the scanned bill **57**”)

43. Graves teaches testing a scanned bill using two sensors, because taking multiple samples of a document increases the “probability of accurate classification of the denomination of a bill” ([0047]). This creates a system where fewer bills will be falsely identified as genuine; this, in turn, creates a more profitable system for its users, because it would create a system where fewer fake bills would be accepted by the user.

44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in the Admitted Prior Art the two-step scanning mechanism as taught by Graves, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination, each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were

predictable, as well as advantageous because it would create a system where fewer bills are falsely marked as genuine, as well as a more profitable system.

45. APA in view of Graves discloses as above, but does not explicitly disclose:
46. recording the document as an image and presenting the image to an operator for visual verification by the operator when the probability does not meet the predetermined criteria and the document is negatively authenticated;
47. wherein the document is accepted when the document has passed a visual examination of the visual verification;
48. the document is refused when the document does not pass the visual examination of the visual verification;
49. wherein the document is fed to a separate storage device for invalid documents or ejected.

50. Stratigos teaches:
51. recording the document as an image (column 3, lines 40-50 - “scanner **27** shines a light on the document and the light reflected off of the document is received by a charge-coupled device...information from the charge-coupled elements is stored in a memory called a ‘graphics image file.’”) and presenting the image (column 4, lines 12-19 - “image of documents determined not to have the proper markings...are then sent to an investigative station **31**”) to an operator (column 2, line 1 - “**operator** may receive the graphic image”) for visual verification (column 4, line 18 - “document can be visually checked”) by the operator when the probability

does not meet the predetermined criteria and the document is negatively authenticated (column 4, lines 12-19 - “image of documents determined not to have the proper markings, and which are suspected to be fakes, are then sent to an investigative station 31”);

52. wherein the document is accepted when the document has passed a visual examination of the visual verification (column 4, lines 12-15 - “sent to an investigative station 31 to be manually confirmed...graphics image file may be directly sent to the data entry work station 33, where the document can be visually checked”);

53. the document is refused when the document does not pass the visual examination of the visual verification (column 4, lines 12-15 - “sent to an investigative station 31 to be manually confirmed...graphics image file may be directly sent to the data entry work station 33, where the document can be visually checked” - if the document does not pass the operator’s visual inspection, then the document is not “manually confirmed” and is thus refused).

54. Stratigos’ system enables bill verification to be “performed rapidly;” it “can take place before the document is honored,” thus avoiding the “problems associated with the prior art” (column 2, lines 6-10). The problems avoided include the “prohibitive amount of time to verify a large number of documents” (column 1, line 26). A person having ordinary skill in the art would see Stratigos’ system as advantageous because it would create a faster-operating system that is also accurate; this in turn creates a more profitable system for its users, because it would create a system where fewer fake bills would be accepted by the user.

55. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include in the Admitted Prior Art and Graves the operator-assisted system as taught by Stratigos, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination,

each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable, as well as advantageous because it would create a system where fewer bills are falsely marked as genuine, as well as a more profitable and faster system.

56. As per claim 2, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

57. two verification methods are selected from: magnetic verification (Graves, [0077] - “magnetic properties of a bill”), image verification (Graves, [0077] - “color of a bill”), UV verification (Graves, [0079] - “UV”), visual verification (Stratigos, column 4, lines 18-20 - “visually checked”).

58. As per claim 5, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

59. visual verification is performed only on documents of a desired value (Graves, [0120-21] - “for each denomination and/or series, the sensitivity of the three tests may be...off...for low denomination modes (e.g. \$1, \$2) the three tests may be set to relatively low sensitivities;” each bill may be set to different sensitivities, or to “off;” the operator determines for which bills he wants the detection to be in the “off” position).

60. As per claim 6, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

61. visual verification method is performed as via direct visual authentication of the image of the document (Stratigos, column 3, lines 60-65 - “the graphics image file is sent to the comparison unit **29**. The comparison unit **29** is programmed to search the graphic image...to compare the densities of at least two specific portions of the document...”).

62. As per claim 9, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

63. operator consists of an entity other than the customer (Stratigos, column 2, lines 1-5 - “an operator.” The operator uses the system in Stratigos in order to “detect forged currency” that another has attempted to use for some type of purchase from the operator - “verification process...can take place before the document is honored”).

64. As per claim 10, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

65. providing a sales machine ([0003] - “a sales machine”) configured for selling public transportation tickets ([0003] - “a sales machine for selling tickets for public transportation”);

66. sales machine configured to facilitate purchase of goods/services by a customer against payment of a document as cash in the form of banknotes or vouchers ([0003] - “banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained...”);

67. providing the sales machine with a verification unit ([0004] - “a verification unit”),

wherein the verification unit is configured for authenticating the document ([0004] - “a verification unit, in which the document is authenticated”);

68. providing the sales machine with a storage for positively authenticated documents

([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained in intermediate storage until the amount of the means payment that have been inserted corresponds to or exceeds the amount of the ticket”);

69. feeding the document to the verification unit by means of an input unit ([0004] -

“transport mechanism”), containing an opening ([0004] - “the same...opening”) into which the document can be inserted individually and consecutively (each document referred to in [0004] is inserted into the “opening”);

70. authenticating the document ([0004] - “document is authenticated and released for further processing”), wherein said authenticating the document is performed with a combination of at least two (Graves, [0077] - “Provided that an error has not been generated as a result of the first comparison...a second comparison is performed”) different verification methods (Graves, [0077] - “This second comparison is performed based on a second type of characteristic information”);

71. comparing the at least two verification methods with verification specifications (Graves, [0006] - “a currency discriminator may detect suspect or counterfeit bills by sensing characteristic information...then comparing the sensed information to the expected characteristics of a bill of the same denomination”);

72. determining a probability (Graves, [0078] - “sufficient correlation”) of authenticity of the document (Graves, [0078] - “CPU **72** retrieves the set or sets of stored second characteristic data

for a genuine bill...and compares the retrieved information with the scanned second characteristic information. If sufficient correlation exists between the retrieved information and the scanned information, the CPU 72 verifies the genuineness of the scanned bill **57”**);

73. releasing the document for further processing, comprising accepting the document as positively authenticated when the probability meets predetermined criteria (Graves, [0078] - “If sufficient correlation exists between the retrieved information and the scanned information, the CPU 72 verifies the genuineness of the scanned bill **57”**), and transporting the document in the storage for positively authenticated documents ([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained in intermediate storage”);

74. recording the document as an image (Stratigos, column 3, lines 40-50 - “scanner **27** shines a light on the document and the light reflected off of the document is received by a charge-coupled device...information from the charge-coupled elements is stored in a memory called a ‘graphics image file.’”) and presenting the image (Stratigos, column 4, lines 12-19 - “image of documents determined not to have the proper markings...are then sent to an investigative station **31**”) to an operator (Stratigos, column 2, line 1 - “**operator** may receive the graphic image”) for visual verification (Stratigos, column 4, line 18 - “document can be visually checked”) by the operator when the probability does not meet the predetermined criteria and the document is negatively authenticated (Stratigos, column 4, lines 12-19 - “image of documents determined not to have the proper markings, and which are suspected to be fakes, are then sent to an investigative station **31**”);

75. wherein the document is accepted when the document has passed a visual examination of the visual verification (Stratigos, column 4, lines 12-15 - “sent to an investigative station **31** to

be manually confirmed...graphics image file may be directly sent to the data entry work station **33**, where the document can be visually checked”), the document is transported in the storage for positively authenticated documents ([0003] - “individual means of payment such as banknotes or vouchers are verified and maintained in intermediate storage”);

76. the document is refused when the document does not pass the visual examination of the visual verification (Stratigos, column 4, lines 12-15 - “sent to an investigative station **31** to be manually confirmed...graphics image file may be directly sent to the data entry work station **33**, where the document can be visually checked” - if the document does not pass the operator’s visual inspection, then the document is not “manually confirmed” and is thus refused), wherein the document is ejected ([0004] - “an invalid document is rejected via the same or a separate opening”).

77. As per claim 11, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

78. two verification methods are selected from: magnetic verification (Graves, [0077] - “magnetic properties of a bill”), image verification (Graves, [0077] - “color of a bill”), UV verification (Graves, [0079] - “UV”), visual verification (Stratigos, column 4, lines 18-20 - “visually checked”).

79. As per claim 12, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

80. visual verification is performed only on documents of a desired value (Graves, [0120-21]
- “for each denomination and/or series, the sensitivity of the three tests may be...off...for low
denomination modes (e.g. \$1, \$2) the three tests may be set to relatively low sensitivities;” each
bill may be set to different sensitivities, or to “off;” the operator determines for which bills he
wants the detection to be in the “off” position).

81. As per claim 13, APA in view of Graves, further in view of Stratigos, discloses as above, and further discloses:

82. operator consists of an entity other than the customer (Stratigos, column 2, lines 1-5 - “an operator.” The operator uses the system in Stratigos in order to “detect forged currency” that another has attempted to use for some type of purchase from the operator - “verification process...can take place before the document is honored”).

Response to Arguments

83. Applicants’ arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Applicants argue limitations that were not previously in the claims – as the arguments have been fully addressed in this Office Action, the arguments are overcome.

Conclusion

84. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Christopher C. Johns whose telephone number is (571)270-3462. The Examiner can normally be reached from Monday through Friday from 9am to 5pm. The Examiner's direct fax line is (571) 270-4462.

85. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer, can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

86. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Christopher C Johns/
Examiner, Art Unit 3621